THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 3.] THURSDAY FEBRUARY 20, 1919. [No. 18.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.

For *bona fide* students Rs 3 only.

Postage As. 13. Extra.

Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.

NARAYANA'S ASHRAMA.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

And in this happy and secluded spot
An Asram dreamed beneath the smiling skies
Amidst the shining emerald paradise
When sun and moon and changing seasons brought
Uncloying deep delight, the sages sought—
Narayana, God infinitely wise
And Nara in his Godward enterprise—
To prove to all the goal of mortal lot,
And God in rapture saw Life's varied play
Upon the changing stage of fleeting Time
In slow and sure fulfilment of His Law,
And by His words set on the Godward way
The dedicated soul which in that clime
Of peace divine thr' Eternal Vision saw.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 20, FEB., 1919.

The Rowlatt Bills.

We have repeatedly declared in these columns,—and we now again repeat—that the people of India, as essentially a mild and peace-loving peple, detest the young Bengal revolutionaries who formed criminal associations for the commission of murders and outrages of all kinds. They detest both their avowed or subconscious aim of conspiring to overthrow the British Government in India and their savage bloodthirstiness resulting in the perpetration of murder, arson, and robbery. It was to put down anarchy and sedition that the Defence of India Act was placed on the Statute-Book The Government now declared that the law had on the whole proved a success, and that anarchical crime and sedition had been largely checked. If Government's anxieties remained, it was only necessary to continue the Act in operation for some time longer, or till they could feel the assurance and conviction that it was no longer needed. Where then, is the need for fresh and even more stringent legislation? The only argument advanced is that Government had created a Commission of the highest possible character and presided over by an eminent English judge and Criminal lawyer of the highest reputation. The Rowlatt Commission had advised the Government to enact these measures, and so the Government were giving effect to their advice. Moreover, the Commission, which contained eminent Indian judges and lawyers, had arrived at an unanimous conclusion, and the Government could not therefore stultify itself if they did not benefit themselves and the country by adopting its recommendations and conclusions. But, meanwhile, Government has found a great improvement in the condition of the land, and it has even released a large number of Bengal *detenus*. The country has a right to ask the Government why it should not wait a little longer to see whether, under the stringent laws already in force, there would not be maintained the present more satisfactory conditions than those which had obtained formerly and for which the Defence Act now in force had been devised. Where is the need for the present hurry to legislate anew and introduce further measures of repression? If the Rowlatt Commission had recommended these measures, there is nothing to prevent Government from waiting a little further to know if the present abatement in seditions or anarchical crime would not continue till it disappears, and that within a reasonable interval of time. There is, also, a *second* reason why the Government might wait a little longer before giving effect to the proposals of the Rowlatt Committe. The War has just ended—that War for the figting of which India in spite of its appalling poverty of resources and its unaccountable dearth of fighting material—both circumstances for which some reasonable measure of responsibility must be laid at the door of our authorities in India and cannot be shirked,—has made substantial sacrifices in Men, Material, Munitions, and Machinery. The War has ended so early,

because the Turks sustained a deadly overthrow in the Asiatic theatre of War, and this began to react on the operations in the Balkan theatre and on the Austrian efforts against our Italian allies. It was because the Austrians and the Turks were overthrown and disabled that the German army was compelled to fall back in the first instance, and then to sue for the cessation of hostilities in the Western theatre. We had long ago foreseen that this was the trend of the course which the war was taking, and Indian anticipations and hopes have been fully realised. As India and her people had taken a substantial share in the bringing on of this conclusion, they had a right to expect that peace would bring to her the benefits arising from a more substantial and enduring union of interests and hearts than has been long desired between our rulers here and ourselves. Already in the announcement of the 20th of August last, there was seen some confirmation of such a hopeful anticipation or expectation,—a'though the mere declaration of a goal without the fixing of a definite time-limit, or of definite steps towards the reaching of it at stated intervals or stages of advance, might not be understood as conveying any definite measure of satisfaction to the heart of a subject people.

Both the grounds above stated justify in ample measure the remarkable opposition to the Rowlatt Bills which has been manifested throughout the country for several weeks or months past, and now also in the Imperial Legislative Council,—an opposition of such overwhelming unanimity that it has been received in the spirit of an electric shock. If the imported anarchism which has distracted Bengal and shocked Indian sentiment all over the land were still as active as it once was, all India would,—circumstanced as we are at present and after the common anxieties and sacrifices borne by all communities during the great war,—cheerfully back up the Government's efforts to put it down, even such repressive measures as these ominous "Rowlatt" Bills,—measures which Sir G. Chitnavis rightly characterised as "likely to leave behind them a legacy of evil more dangerous than the evil it was sought to eradicate." All India would even, as the Hon'ble the Rajah of Mahmudabad said, "support the proclamation of martial law" in order to suppress the diabolical evil of anarchism. The people of India are unanimous in thinking not only that the Government may well resolve to wait for a time before taking action on the Rowlatt Committee's Report, but that, if these measures are passed, they would seriously endanger the political life now existing in the land and deprive the country of those political liberties and rights which it owes entirely to British love of freedom and fair play. Such a resolve would certainly not mean that the Rowlatt Report is to be shelved. It would only mean that the Government would assure itself that the present improvement is not to be relied on as indicating a permanent cessation of this anarchical aberration, and then only that it would avail itself of the suggestions for improvement contained in the Report.

Much more might be stated here, but everything that can be said in favour of staying the present resolve of Government to pass these measures has been said, and in full measure,

both in the Imperial Legislative Council and by the speakers at various public meetings all over the land. There is no need to lengthen the argument. If the Government persists in its resolve to get these measures passed, let us hope that their application will be carefully guarded so as only to involve the perpetrators of anarchical and seditious outrages. The people of India at large—the "dumb" millions and hundreds of millions—can only have their rights as citizens safeguarded through the microscopic minority which has learned the Western methods of agitation and can thereby make itself heard by the men who command the wheels of the machinery of administration. If these new measures of legislation can be utilised or strained in any measure, so as to restrict even the legitimate activities of the few public men of India who desire to work for the safe-guarding of public interests against encroachments, on the ground that they might cause public discontent or temporary inconvenience of some kind to somebody, then public life in India will be throttled and merely cease to be. It is this feeling that lies at the basis of the universal opposition to these measures. Let us hope that the Government will succeed in confining their operation so as to run only the anarchist criminal and sedition-monger to the earth and not to cause fright or inconvenience to the small knot of public-spirited men who now devote themselves to the useful, but inconvenient or risky, function of political agitation or public comment on the aims and measures of Government.

"Is India Civilised" by Sir John Woodroffe.

V. The Elements of Triumph.

Every unprejudiced observer of our society and our social and spiritual ideals has borne emphatic testimony to the greatness of the Indian race and the Indian culture. Sir John Woodroffe says: "The same India which in the person of the Sannyasi fled from the world to the forest also glorified that world in sumptuous art. India was meditative and yet gave birth to men of action celebrated as warriors and statesmen, and a people who governed themselves practically with succes.... India has produced men successfully in industry and in commerce." Mr. J. H. Jackwell says in *Religion and Reality*: "In our main conclusion we have long ago been anticipated by the religious philosophy of India....This great stroke of identity, this discernment of the ultimate unity of all things in Brahman or the One Absolute Self seems to us to constitute the master-piece and highest achievement of India's wonderful and metaphysical and religious genius to which the West has yet to pay the full tribute which is its due."

If thus the unitive vision of life, and the subordination of the secular to the spiritual, the partial to the complete, the fleeting to the Eternal be the glory and the real strength of the Indian culture, the triumph of Indian culture depends on the preservation and perfection of this vital element. What is the secret of the immortal vitality of the Indian people despite disunion and invasion? It is that India has always been in touch with the Fount of Life and that her loyalty to the Eternal Spirit has

given her the inalienable dower of the power of perpetual self-renewal.

During the epoch when it looked as if India would go to pieces England came and threw her shield of protection between India and anarchy. But English culture has tried to dominate our culture in the fields of education, social life, and industrial and political life, and the time is now come when India is in the throes of the self-alienation of her own children from her culture. Further, the shrinkage of the world owing to the omnipotence of steam and electricity has drawn India into the vortex of universal life. Hence India has to turn to her own strength to attain self-possession and self-preservation and dower her culture with the crown of perfect and radiant self-expression.

We have hence first and foremost to gather up and focus our scattered and depressed elements of strength. The first and foremost work is in the realm of education. We have here to bring to prominence and perfection the ideals and methods of Indian cultural life—which places emphasis upon a synthesis of secular and spiritual life and of nature and society—both in the educational sphere and in the realm of later life. When we have reintroduced Indian art, religion, and history into our scheme of studies and when we have re-assured our originality and fecundity by a predominent attention to our own languages and literatures side by side with the cultivation and assimilation of modern science, the elements of triumph in the realm of education would gather power and volume and sweep in a majestic flood towards the self-fulfilment of the national life. For this it is further necessary that the guidance and control of Indian education should be in the hands of Indians—a truth so self-evident that it is a wonder that it should be regarded in any quarter as needing demonstration.

When this is done the radiant self-preservation and self-realisation of the race would be achieved by the self-consecration of the young men and women so filled and dominated by the great racial ideals. The triumph of the racial spirit is in the hands of each generation and there is no doubt that we make or mar our own destiny. It is only such properly trained young men and women who will love our Dharma and realise its eternal truth and value and demonstrate their loyalty to it by living in its light. Another important contributory cause for the triumph of Indian culture is the preservation of our social ideals and the realisation that it makes for efficiency through co operation, purity through Achara, God-realisation through the realisation of duty. Sir John Woodroffe says well : " Each fraction of the body of the Lord should, whilst preserving itself and holding to its duty, help the other to preserve the harmony of the whole. Hinduism has provided for this organization within India and amongst its followers by the wonderful Varnashrama Dharma." In another place he says : "Samanya Dharma or the general rules of morality govern all castes and all men. Each man must be truthful, charitable, just, free from pride and so forth. It is the particular rules called Visesha Dharma which bind only members of a particular caste. As a matter of fact the high caste of a Brahmana connotes more rigorous injunctions (Niyama) than those imposed on the Sudra. The result which (as recently pointed

out by H. H. Shri Sankaracharya at Kumbakonam) the latter can attain by a minimum of Niyama, is only to be had by the Brahmana through a maximum of the same. The followers of the Varnashrama Dharma do not, like adherents of some other religions, hold that those who follow their own religious faith are less fitted for salvation than themselves. Any one who follows the Dharma of his own caste; any non-Hindu who follows the Dharma of his own religion with faith in its truth and in God will necessarily rise in the scale of spiritual growth and have that material and spiritual happiness to which his actions entitle him."

The triumph of our culture is more than anything else bound up with our loyalty to our immemorial *sadhanas* of spiritual life. Our community has always maintained its vitality and its power only by its strong hold on the spiritual life. Only by our regulation of life in the light of the laws of the realm of the spirit can our racial genius shine forth. Only where spirituality exists do moral excellences, material splendour, and individual perfections come in harmonious combination and with eternal vitality. Sir John says well: "For spirituality is honoured of all men and where it truly exists, there are other excellences." He says further: "Let us look at the matter broadly and freely and then we shall see that as a matter of fact there is no religion which more justly and logically balances the claims of the life of the world and the life of spirit as does Hinduism. Let us never forget another truth which he expresses: "It is the fact that there are 'chosen' peoples just as there are exceptionally endowed individuals. Greece was a chosen people for her wonderful art and philosophy. India for her religion and profound metaphysics; and other peoples have been in various ways distinguished."

The most important of all the truths which Sir John enforces again and again with all the resources of discriminative eloquence is that India needs power for the triumph of her culture. If we forget this, our aliveness and alertness in other respects will have no flowering or fruitage. Let us write in letters of gold on our hearts the following precious advice given by Sir John Woodroffe: "What is wanted is power (Shakti). It is wonderful to see how throughout the world, in East and West, this idea of power is spreading concomitantly with the consciousness of man's essential Divinity. If there be one people whose doctrine (whatever be their practice) preaches self-reliance, it is India."

Notes and Comments.

Dewan Bahadur P. Theagaraya Chettiar presiding at a discussion on the Hon. Mr. Patel's Marriage Bill at the Anderson Hall, Madras said:—"There was no caste during the days of the Vedic period." It would be interesting to know whence our distinguished countryman obtained this assurance regarding Hindu society in the Vedic period. It cannot be from any purely indigenous Hindu source. for the Hindus regard the Vedas as beginningless (*anadi*) and as emanating from the Supreme Isvara at the commencement of the creation of the Universe. So, we assume that he is quoting from a Western Orientalist. But Oriental scholarship in the West is totally unreliable and fluctuating. Moreover, it commits the most absurd blunders. For the information of Mr. Chettiar, we will give the latest pronouncement on Caste in the Veda. It is con-

tained in Macdonnell and Keith's recent work known as "The Vedic Index." Their pronouncement is as follows:—"It seems certain that in the Rig-Veda this Brahmana or Brahmin is already a separate caste differing from the warrior and agricultural castes. The texts regularly claim for them a superiority to the Kshatriya caste. If it is necessary to recognise, as is sometimes done, that the Brahmin does pay homage to the King at the Rajasuya, nevertheless the unusual fact is carefully explained away so as to leave the priority of the Brahmin unaffected. But it is expressly recognised that the union of the Kshatriya and the Brahmana is essential for complete prosperity. It is admitted that the King or the nobles might at times oppress the Brahmins, but it is indicated that ruin is then certain swiftly to follow." Professors Mcdonnell and Keith are the latest and most advanced among the Oriental scholars now living, and we trust that their pronouncement will be accepted as authoritative by our public men and leaders.

*
* *

It will be noticed that these two scholars speak about the Rig-Veda *as a whole*, and they do not base their opinion on any single or stray passage,—for they speak of "*the texts regularly* claiming &c." We draw attention to this circumstance, for the *Purusha Sukta* which is the authority usually quoted and most widely known is often the subject of acrimonious contention among scholars in respect of its date and its interpretation.

*
* *

As regards its date, while some scholars regard it as comparatively modern in its language, métre and style, and therefore not a genuine part of the Rig-Veda, Dr. Martin Haug says of this view;—"There is no sufficient evidence to prove that. On the contrary, reasons might be adduced to show that it is even old." We have also to take into account the fact pointed out by the French scholar, De La Saussaye, that "this hymn describes how the world was formed out of the limbs of an original man, which conception is proved by camparative philology to be very ancient."

As regards the interpretation of the passage, some regard it as the statement of the *historical* fact of creation, while others regard it as an *allegory*. It seems to us that the allegorical interpretation cannot be maintained,—for the hymn speaks not only of the creation of the four castes from the mouth, the arm, the thigh and the legs, but of the creation of the Sun and Moon, the Sky, Indra, Vayu and other Devas, animals, wild and tame, horses, sheep, cows, &c. Bhatta Bhaskara, the Vedic Commentator, attempts to harmonise the two views when he says that "as Brahmins and others have sprung from the face, &c., they are represented as such (*i.e.*, as being the face, &c.")

*
* *

We may seek, further, the aid of comparative religion in regard to this matter. The foremost of Modern Indian scholars, Dr. Rajah Rajendra Lall Mitra, late of Calcutta, has, in a brilliant essay, pointed out that the ancestors of the ancient Persians and Hindus once lived together as a single community, and that they separated later on. If, therefore, the fourfold caste-system was common to both the Persians and the Hindus *ofter* their separation, then they must have inherited it from their common social life before that event. And this fact is pointed out by the French scholar already once referred to,—De La Saussaye. He says:—"More especially among the Persians, the same four Hindu castes are mentioned (*Yasna*, XIX 46) *From this we can naturally see that this division cannot be the product of any specially Hindu development, but existed already in the oldest, at least Indo-Persian, times.*" The people of the Rig-Vedic age themselves inherited the institution of caste from the Indo-Persian times, which recede into a remote antiquity of which no conception can be formed and which can only be spoken of as "the oldest times." (*De La Saussaye*). We think that sufficient has been said here to dispose of the suggestion that the caste-system has been invented in some *post*-Vedic period by some Satanic personage belonging to the Brahmin caste and imposed on a credulous and

ignorant Hindu populace. Let our readers ponder over the fact that the modern science of comparative religion and the ancient spiritual science of the Veda are equally at one in ascribing the origin of caste to "the oldest times." It is no wonder that the social organism which can recede into some immemorial and primeval antiquity has still a vitality which defies all the changes of time and circumstance and stands unshaken as a rock amidst the assaults, often insidious and envenomed, of the faddist and the fanatic, of the social revolutionist and the political agitator.

* * *

Another strange idea of Dewan Rahadur P. Theagaroya Chettiar is that "when the Aryans came to Southern India the Dravidians became their servants." How can a whole race or people become the servants of another which does not rule? The Brahmins, too, are often found to serve non-Brahmins. Furthermore, our ancient books speak of a class of *Brahma-Bandhus* (born Brahmins, but possessing no special merit) as on a level with "women and Sudras,"—women being understood as comprising those of the Brahmin caste also. This shows that it is not correct to say that all Dravidians could not have become servants of all Brahmins or Aryans. Moreover, the Aryan colonists or "comers" were few in number, and could not have wanted or engaged the services of all Dravidians. Lastly, Manu speaks of the Dravidians as Kshatriyas, and this shows that many Dravidians—if not all—were also Aryan in race.

* * *

Dewan Bahadur P. Theagaroya Chettiar says that "in these days a Brahmin did the duties of a Kshatriya, the duties of another caste, and so there was no hard and fast rules for the castes in the performance of their duties." This only refers to the political or public duties in regard to which our British rulers have ignored the Hindu social divisions. But the Hindu religion remains, and Hindus still, therefore, continue to maintain the ancient institutions and observances of the Hindu religion. So long as this is the case, the Hindu caste-system will continue, and ought to be permitted to continue. Those who want to abandon the Hindu religion can easily do so in these days and thereby place themselves outside the caste system in regard to marriage. Why, then, should Mr. Patel or any other seek to introduce mixed marriages and thereby to destroy or dislocate an institution which is closely wedded with the Hindu religion, and has been such from the remotest antiquity.

* * *

The Hindu sacred books condemn altogether Pratiloma marriages, but allow Anuloma marriages only for purposes of *upabhoga*. They condemn them as injurious from a spiritual point of view. Mr. Patel's bill, therefore, stands condemned by all genuine Hindu authorities. No doubt there are cases mentioned of Anuloma unions. But they took place either irregularly or have a meaning and significance which have no practical bearing on the conditions obtaining today, as we can easily see by an investigation of the context in which they appear. We have ourselves referred to some of them in these columns in previous issues. There is nothing to be gained by shutting our eyes to their true significance as we can gather it from the context in which they are found. Moreover, the ancient Hindu Kings had the function of preserving and guarding the Dharma, and this enabled them to prevent such irregular matrimonial unions as occasionally took place from producing evil social or spiritual effects. Our present British rulers have wisely abstained from interference in our society and religion, except where they regarded any practice or custom as physically injurious or abhorrent to their notions of right and wrong. We do not see why this question of marriage should be settled by inaugurating a new policy of interference which is in direct contravention of that which has so long been in force and with such benefit to Hindu society. If once interference like this is sought, we do not know where it is to stop. In the Western world, great changes of opinion are taking place, and men are found to advocate temporary marriages,

trial marriages, and so on. Why should we, Hindus, allow our society to be the object of legislative experiments? There is the absurd notion that, if we destroy caste by instituting intermarriges and interdining among all castes, that will bring political unity. This absurd idea has been frequently exposed by us in these columns. We have only to look at the recent and present condition of distraction and revolutionary disturbance in Europe. But, our new men are here guided, too, by the same or similar emotions of racial, national and communal discord. If the truly noble Hindu conceptions of spiritual peace and freedom and the spiritual intent of the social organisation devised by Heaven and inseparably associated with them are to be abandoned by a stroke of a modern legislator's pen, why may we not go further and disestablish by an equally valid fiat of legislative unwisdom the Hindu races which have so long inhabited this ancient land and replace them by the immigration of peoples who now inhabit other parts of the world and would gladly take possession of the places vacated by us here.

Multiple-authorship of the Vedanta-Sutras.

[BY R. NAGA RAJA SARMA.]

Even in the generally prosaic and unromantic realm of philosophy, the romantic element, sometimes, does make its appearance, as might easily be evidenced from a piece of philosophical discovery that was recently announced by certain critics in Madras. The startling discovery was that as many as forty-five stanzas of the Bhagavad-Gita had been missing—being perhaps, stolen away by a literary clepto-maniac, and consequently, nothing. at any rate, being known to Sri Sankara about them—almost from time immemorial, and that they could be delivered back unto humanity, by means of a work, attributed to a Yogin who is supposed to belong to an occult organisation known as the *Suddha Dharma-Mandala.*

Now, Prof. Belvalkar (see his article in the Issue of the "Indian Philosophical Review" for December 1918) asks us to believe that the Vedanta-Sutras should have been the work of several authors, and we make no secret of the fact that this appears to us as romantic as the Madras discovery. The Professor doubtless affirms that he himself does not think he has absolutely proved the multiple-authorship of the Vedanta-Sutras, and hence, we hope we will not be misunderstood if we offer a few remarks on the Internal Evidence adduced by him in support of his theory.

The arguments of the Professor may thus be summed up:—(*a*) The whole of the *Tarka-pada* is out of place; for the sutras need not go out of their way and deliver attacks against other systems. (*b*) The term "तथा in the sutra "तथा प्राणाः" constitutes an awkward beginning for a pada—(2, 4,) and the immediately preceeding discussion, forming the concluding portion of the last pada is hence, an interpolation. (*c*) The discussion regarding the तत्पदार्थ (3, 2—) is an interpolation, because, as it is, it is irrelevant. (*d*) And the Upanishadic passages chosen for discussion, in the first Adhyaya, are taken *seriatim* from the Chhandogya; but a passage from the कौषीतकि intervenes and hence it is an interpolation.

To our mind, however, the aforesaid arguments do not appear convincing; because, in the first place it is a gratuitous assumption to hold that the sutrakara should not refute other systems. The sutras were, composed with a view to securing तत्वनिर्णय and that is possible only by means of a conclusive refutation of the systems of thought opposed to the Vedanta. तत्वनिश्चयस्तु स्वपक्षसाधनपरपक्षदूषणाभ्यामेव साध्यान्—Sri Sankara's objection that the sutras need not refute the other systems, and his subsequent reply cannot lend any support to Prof. Belvalkar's theory, seeing that there are reasons far more weighty. why it is absolutely necessary for the author of the Vedanta Sutras to refute other systems.

The second chapter in which the pada in question occurs is called the अविरोधाध्याय—which means, a chapter devoted to the removal of contradictions. In the previous chapter, it was pointed out how all the terms are applicable only to Brahman, and this theory—समन्वय, as it is called—involves a fourfold contradiction which should be re-

solved by any consistent thinker. A passage runs thus:—

अत्राद्यपादे युक्त्यविरोधः, द्वितीयेऽलौकिकार्थगोचरबहुजनपरिगृहीतवाक्यसंतर्परूपसमयाऽविरोधः, तृतीये केवलश्रुत्यविरोधः, चतुर्थे सयुक्तिकश्रुत्यविरोध इति–विरोधिनां युक्त्यादीनां चातुर्विध्यात्तान्निरूप्याऽविरोधोऽपि चतुर्विध इति तत्प्रतिपादकपादभेदः ।

From the passage just quoted, even he who runs may read that all the padas of this chapter, as they are, perfectly find their *Raison de etre*, and especially that the second pada which is devoted to the removal of an important variety of contradiction or विरोध cannot be so easily dismissed and written down an interpolation, seeing that it is absolutely essential and necessary for the Sutrakara, to refute the heterodox systems. Take any Sutras you please and you will find an allusion to and refutation of some other system or systems of thought, and we, at any rate, hesitate to conclude that such of the Sutras as refute the latter, are interpolations. We have heard it said that only the first Adhyaya of the *Nyayasutras* can be attributed to Gotama and that the later ones are interpolations, because, they contain certain Sutras which refute some of the Sankhya doctrines. Such a line of argument is not only not conclusive but positively erroneous and mischievous, as it can well be employed to doubt the genuineness of every system of Sutras. The only inference that can be legitimately drawn is that at the time of writing the Sutras, certain heterodox systems of thought had sprung into such importance and prominence as to require an authoritative repudiation. In a word, the Tarka-pada can never support the multiple-authorship of the Sutras.

In regard to the second argument of Prof. Belvalkar, we readily admit that it is perhaps more plausible than the previous one, but hardly more convincing. For, he himself admits that the Commentator *Vallabha* has so interpreted the Sutra तथा प्राणाः, as to bring it in conformity with the immediately preceeding discussion, by making the प्राणs immortal. Therefore, in as much as, there is at any rate an interpretation which dovetails the previous and the present discussion, it is not accurate to dispose of the former—*i. e.*, the discussion regarding the nature of the individual soul—as an interpolation. Again if it could be shown that the discussion relating to the nature of the जीव, does logically and systematically follow from the earlier part of the pada itself, it would certainly be ill-advised to break up this continuity, and discard the latter part of the pada as spurious, for the reason that the term तथा does not form a good beginning for the new pada (2, 4—) In fact, a celebrated writer on the sutra prasthana has clearly pointed out how there is an unbroken continuity in thought between the earlier and the latter half of the third pada, which involves a discussion on the nature of the soul. The passage is doubtless long but worth extracting:

अस्मिन्पाद आद्यमधिकरणत्रिकमुत्पत्यनुत्पत्तिश्रुत्योर्विरोधनिरासकत्वेनैकापेटिका । चतुर्थपञ्चमषष्ठानि तेज आदेरुत्पत्तिं स्वीकृत्योत्पाद्योत्पादकभावरूपसंबन्धविषयकविरोधे शङ्किते, तन्निरासकत्वेनैका पेटिका । सप्तमाष्टमनवमदशमानि संहारविषयाविरोधनिरासकत्वेनैका पेटिका......एकादशमारभ्यैकोनविंशतिपर्यन्तानि जीवविषयत्वेनैका पेटिका । तच्चाधिकरणनवकं, यथाक्रमं, जीवस्य, सादित्व, अणुत्व, अनेकदेहस्थितत्व, इश्वरभिन्नत्व अनंतत्व ज्ञानानन्दादिरूपत्व, परतन्त्रकर्तृत्व, ईश्वरांशत्व, तत्प्रतिबिंबत्वरूपप्रमेयनवकप्रतिपादकमिति द्रष्टव्यम् ।

Now, the arrangement of the sutras in the foregoing passage is fairly clear and consistent. To begin with, the creation of the अधिभूत is discussed and then the dissolution thereof. Next, naturally comes up the question of the अध्यात्म and consequently, the entire discussion regarding the nature of the individual soul is perfectly in place and necessary, and hence, very little or nothing is gained by regarding it an interpolation. When the अध्यात्म discussion is finished, the nature of the pranas is taken up. The sutra ज्ञोऽत एव establishes that the Finite, individual souls derive their existence from the *paramatman* and a similar conclusion is held to be valid in the case of the pranas as well. When this interpretation of the sutra is considered, the full significance and appropriateness of the term तथा are brought out. The sutras then would mean;—Just as the जीवs even so are the प्राणs—It will thus be apparent that the discussion on the

nature of the जीव does perfectly fit in with the earlier part of the pada (2-3—) and constitutes a very legitimate and graceful prolegomena to a consideration of the प्राण्स with which the fourth pada of the second chapter rightly commences.

The third argument of the Professor is that it is illogical to tack on the topic of तत्पदार्थविवेचन at the end of the second pada of the third Adhyaya. I here notice an inaccuracy. The whole of the second pada is known as the तत्वंपदार्थपरिशोधनाख्यः पादः। And I don't think that the third pada of the II chapter is called the त्वंपदार्थविवेचनपाद—It is known as the जीवश्रुतिविरोधपरिहारपाद The commentator of Sri Sankara remarks:—

The previous pada (3—1) was styled the वैराग्यनिरूपणपाद—and the result of वैराग्य is of course the तत्त्वंपदार्थविवेक for the exposition of which the present pada has commenced. Here, I am unable to see any want of logic in bringing the तत्पदार्थ in the present pada. According to another interpretation the arrangement of the padas and the topics therein leaves very little to be desired The Adhyaya in question is called the साधनाध्याय which means a chapter devoted to the discussion of the means of attaining Brahman. The best of the means is doubtless Bhakti. भक्तिरस्मिन्पाद उच्यते। भक्त्यर्थं भगवन्महिमोक्तिः। This pada is devoted to an exposition of Bhakti or Devotion, and this devotion would be impossible if you do not have an accurate knowledge of the object of Bhakti. Hence, the power of the Lord—भगवान्—on whom one should meditate is here described. He is the controller and lord of all, even of your dreams and so forth. Therefore, with a view to enabling the Bhakta or Devotee to get a clear idea of the Highest on whom he is to concentrate his attention, the author of the sutras has described the nature of Brahman in the present context. This is certainly not as illogical as it is made out to be by the Professor, at any rate not so illogical as to stand self-condemned or warrant the critic's conclusion that the whole account of Brahman here given is an interpolation.

In reference to the fourth argument of the Professor, it is necessary to point out that Dr. Deussen, in his *System of the Vedanta*, has clearly shown that in the first Adhyaya certain passages from the Chhandogya Upanishad are taken up *seriatim* for discussion. Besides कौषीतकि various other Upanishads—such as Katha, Brihadaranyaka, Mundaka etc.—are also referred to and from them also the passages are taken *seriatim*. In our opinion, the references to Upanishads other than the Chhandogya cannot prove the multiple-authorship of the Vedanta-sutras. For there is a very good reason why passages from various Upanishads should be chosen. In order to secure complete demonstration for the theory of समन्वय the author of the sutras has thought it necessary to undertake a comprehensive search and has sought to string together various passages—the variety exhibiting only an additional proof for the central doctrine of समन्वय. The reason why great preference is given to the *Chhandogya* is to be sought probably in the fact that it contained most conflicting passages which were in need of a harmonising agency. From this, one has no evidence to conclude that the intervening कौषीतकि passage is an interpolation. The theory or suggestion that every blessed Upanishad, long or short,—including perhaps, even the recently unearthed अल्लोपनिषत्—which extols the greatness of Allah—had a system of Sutras of its own, appears to us to be too fantastic.

Concluding then, I personally believe that the Vedanta-Sutras were written only by one author, and not by many. A too rigorous application, to our sacred Literature, of the Western canons and standards of criticism is bound to defeat its own purpose and prove utterly futile. For instance, the माहेश्वर Sutras of Vyakarana are *only fourteen* in number, and perhaps the same number of Sutras would do for the Vedanta as well. So the first ten or twenty Sutras alone can be attributed to an author and the rest may be regarded as later interpolations!! The theory then, of the multiple-authorship of the Vedanta-Sutras, can be viewed only in the light of a provisional hypothesis pending complete demonstration.

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager "*The Hindu Message*", Srirangam.

The Inter-Caste Marriage Bill.

[By SRIKANTA SASTRIGAL, Agent to His Holiness Sri Sankaracharya, Sringeri Mutt.]

According to Hindu Dharma Sastras, the Hindus are divided into four castes—Brahmanas, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas and Sudras. One begotten by a Brahmana on a Brahmana woman in lawful wedlock is a Brahmana by caste. Similarly, one begotten by a Kshatriya on a Kshatriya woman is a Kshatriya. Thus a person begotten by a man of one caste on a woman of the same caste is said to belong to that particular caste, and not otherwise.

2. The first three classes are said to receive Samskaras—Sacraments—with only Vedic Mantras from the time they are in the womb till their death and even after, while the fourth class are purified by only a few of the Samskaras but without the Vedic Mantras.

3. Marriage is the most important of all such Samskaras. In performing marriages among the Hindus due regard is had to the degrees in which they are prohibited to marry, the time for marriage, the difference in the ages of the husband and wife, the right of the person giving the girl in marriage, the mode of marriage, the ceremonials that go to validate the marriage, all of which have been dealt with in detail in the Dharma Sastras.

4. One begotten of Hindu parents that married only according to the rules of marriage as laid down above, becomes entitled to the ancestral property and competent to give funeral oblations to his Pitris (Manes). On the other hand, one born of unequal marriages (Anuloma and Pratiloma) is unfit either to claim the ancestral property or to give funeral oblations.

5. The doctrine of Hinduism does not consist in mere acquisition of wealth in this world, enjoyment of life, and leaving the body at the last moment. Hindus, believing as they do in the existence of the next world, after-birth, merit and demerit whose fruits are binding on them and cannot be escaped from, have been acting up to them, basing their faith on the dictates of their Dharma Sastras and immemorial custom and usage.

6. The Hindus have strong belief that their Dharma Sastras were framed by the renowned Rishis of yore, who were endowed with unparalleled insight, will-power, learning, sympathy, purity, integrity, and who rigorously acted up to the ideals, and it is on the strength of that conviction that not less than 95 per cent of the Hindu population who are not subjected to the influence of the Western civilisation, can be seen even to this day to follow up as far as possible the dictates of these Shastras.

7. It is well-known that every one of the Emperors and vassal kings who reigned over India in former days administered justice to the people according to the dictates of Hindu Law and it is an undisputed fact that even now the British Government are guided by the Hindu Law in the administration of justice to their Hindu subjects in matters affecting their Acharas, Succession and other civil rights.

8. While the Dharma Sastras are the important guides to the conduct of Hindus in their religious and social affairs as pointed out above, if marriages so essential to their very existence be now contracted in contravention of the rules of the Dharma Sastras and their immemorial usage, would the offspring born of such marriages become Hindus?

9. Would a man become Hindu by reason of his observing the rules of conduct as laid down in the Dharma Sastras or merely by reason of his mere birth in the territorial limits of the land called Hindustan? In the latter case, why should not Muhammadans, living as they do in India, be classed as Hindus?

10. Does marriage among Hindus imply the mere union of a man and a woman under some contract for purpose of mere enjoyment of life or is it a sacrament, becoming valid only after the observance of certain ceremonies? If the latter is true, what are those validating sacraments? Have they been laid down in the Dharma Sastras? Or, are they quite different ones? If it is agreed that they are as laid down in Dharma Sastras, he who strictly observes Dharma Sastras in all matters connected with the selection of bridegroom and bride and other allied matters, will be bound to follow up the same Sastras in the matter of these Samskaras. How can marriages performed partly according to Dharma Sastras and partly contrarily to same, become valid in law?

11. Can ancestral property be inherited merely by virtue of birth in the family-line? Or by reason of the inheritor liquidating his debt to his ancestor from whom the property is acquired? If the former, why have not daughters a right to the ancestral property equally with surviving sons? Why do not defectives though males and unmarried males become entitled to shares in the ancestral property? Is it that they were not born in the line? This proves beyond doubt that if one aspires for property of an ancestor, he shall reciprocally do him the duty towards him—*i. e.*, by the giving of funeral oblations strictly according to the Dharma Sastras. Hence it is that if there are surviving sons, daughters do not acquire the right to give funeral oblations to their ancestors. It is also ruled that the defectives have no right of claim in the ancestral property because of their incapacity to give funeral oblations.

12. From this it becomes evident that whoever has the right to give funeral oblations to his ancestors, becomes the rightful claimant to the ancestral property. This binding rule cannot be met with elsewhere than among the Hindus. These are matters of implication and inference as not being perceivable to the naked eyes that the dead are satisfied with the oblations offered by their descendants, and where and in what form they will be after their death in this world. So in these matters the Dharma Sastras are to be taken as authority. If accordingly the Dharma Sastras are to be relied upon, he who is the offspring of a marriage performed according to the Sastras, becomes eligible to give oblations to his Manes—Pitris—and thereby entitles himself to claim their property, while on the other hand, one begotten by a man on a woman married at his own will and pleasure, actuated merely by lust, cannot be expected to claim ancestral property or to give oblations.

13. If it is opined that there is scope according to Hindu Law for Hindus to have inter-caste marriages performed, there would have been reason now to approach the Government with a view to have a ruling from them that such marriages are legal and to amend the existing laws in vogue for a long time. The mere request to amend the laws itself implies that such marriages are not in accordance with the Dharma Sastras.

14. The Hindus are bound to obey the Hindu Law and other decisions issued from time to time based on Hindu Dharma Sastras. And there is no doubt that all are to be bound by any rules Government may be pleased to pass in modification thereof.

15. The reforms proposed by the Honourable V. J. Patel in the Bill introduced by him to validate inter-caste marriages are not based on the Dharma Sastras. They may be said to have been influenced by men having their own way of uncontrolled and unrestricted action. Under the circumstances it seems expedient to expect the Government to take the opinion of each and every Hindu in the land before the projected reforms are introduced. Besides, the Government of India who have proclaimed strictest religious neutrality will certainly be not well-advised to bind the majority of the Hindus with the will of a few that form the minority.

15. To sum up, marriage among the Hindus is the real foundation upon which the superstructure of the Hindu Religion is laid. So long as the kind of marriage laid down in the Dharma Sastras is maintained, the Hindus will have an individuality all their own and will continue to possess such becoming virtues in them as fear of merit and demerit, faith in God, loyalty to the Sovereign, self-restraint, forbearance, last but not least, their very religion itself.

16. Were the Bill to become Law, it will surely uproot the Hindu Religion and plunge the whole nation into an abyss of unparalleled chaos and disorder socially, religiously and legally.

Marriages made easy.

[BY V. MAHALINGA AIYAR M.A.]

(Continued.)

The corps of Sydenham and Nair point to this ban upon dinner and marriage between castes; and cry "halt" to political reform. "Therefore," cry the patriots, "we shall reform our society forthwith!" The corps of resistance show out the bogey of Brahmin oligarchy. "therefore," shout the patriots, "abolish Brahmins themselves, by permitting inter-caste marriage!" We have read in Grimm or other fairy tale-teller that ardent lovers were prescribed terrible adventures

after the accomplishment of which alone the fair one could be given in marriage. But each achievement was followed *not* by the surrender of the bride, but only by fresh prescriptions. And eventually the bride was won, not with the consent of the promisor, but by force. Such prescriptions were only apparently to test, but really to delay, if possible to deny. They are prescribed with the hope that they may not be fulfilled. They are not really conditions precedent. And we are really dupes and simpletons, if we hold them such, and proceed piously to shake and rend society on that account. These are tricks for adjournment; and we but argue for our opponents, if we undertake a Herculean work of social devastation at their bidding.

And the worst part of the matter is, that the protagonists of the bill imagine themselves very cunning in their procedure. They pursue the line of least resistance, they present only the thin end of the wedge, hoping thereby to lull the conservative. But the conservative is not lulled: he is awake; he is a thinker in his own way; the reason of institutions is incorporated in him; it is alert and being alarmed swings itself with energy into opposition.

The only result of this sublime and sinuous strategy is an accession of strength to the vocalist in the Sydenham camp. He would say: "This small measure of permissive reform is welcomed with such a storm of disapproval; and yet you talk of a nation etc." And the strategist should confess that his nation is a corpse indeed, that even he could not quicken it into life.

Such will always be the result of amateur advocacy, in this instance amateur patriots tinkering with patriotism. Mr. Patel, Mr. Shastri, Mr. Gokhale, may all be very public-spirited men; most emphatically they are not patriots. Gokhale, who is said by his admirer Principal Paranjpye, not to have cared for the study of Indian history, is emphatically not a patriot. Patriot implies a father, and a father implies a past, patriotism is love of the past, preservation of past greatness; not a running away from the past, and a gallopping to embrace the future (whose shape is unknown).

The bill, as a strategic more in the immediate game of politics, is bound to prove a failure; is indeed a remedy worse than the disease, can serve only as fuel to the fire of opposition. But it is perhaps uncharitable to view it as a mere piece of cunning.

It may really be designed to liberate the instincts, which are supposed to be raging, for inter-caste marriages, and which are foiled by the prevalent social tyranny. It may even be hoped that the bill, if passed into law, may *create the taste by which it is to be enjoyed*, may operate as an epoch-making masterpiece in social invention,

The opinion of Sir Rabindranath Tagore has been blazoned abroad in support of the Bill. The poet feels humiliated to find opposition to the Bill. Humiliation proceeds from a detection of meanness in oneself or one's kith and kin. Here the Poet feels humiliated, I suppose not at the meanness of those who oppose; but at the mean opinion that they have of Hindu society. The opponents of the bill imagine that the Hindu society is so weak and vulnerable that this law could injure it; and this opinion of some Hindus regarding the Hindu society humiliates the Hindu Poet. He seems to be sure that large numbers of Hindus would not take advantage of the bill, but only the elect, just a few heroes, the flower of the Hindu race would do so.

The poet misses all consideration in the opponents of the bill. If the Goverument of of India refuses to pass the bill, it is a passive coercion. by the geverning power. This coercion would be obliging the incipient reformer to observe, against his will, the convention of marrying within the caste; this convention is not at all based upon the foundation of the moral laws. The poet is assured that the reformer would have to endure social martyrdom; but he cannot endure that upon this martyrdom should be piled passive coercion by the governing power. The reformer who wants to marry outside of his caste but is compelled to live below the truth and courage of that yearning. is a victim living falsely and cowardly. If the Hindu society should have for its foundation such a hecatomb of victims, let that society perish rather! the poet exclaims.

Now, even Rabindranath may in particulars be admired amiss. This screaming phraseology and effervescent argumentation of the poet certainly call for some scrutiny.

Martyrdom is a word that has now become a rag in Indian public life. The raging reformer scorns the society (which is supposed to victimise him) as a herd of antiquated fools; and he is concerned precious little at their rusticating him. He cares not for their frowns at all; he gaily goes or runs on his road of reform.

What he may be concerned at is the feeling in his own home. It may be urged that his parents resent inter-caste marriage, because of the social pressure. In all but exceptional cases, the parents themselves are of the same herd of "ancient" fools. They are of the same opinion as society; they are elements in that pressure. Some fanatics of reform may care little even for the feeling of parents. But they are restrained in their further "progress" by the thirst for money, money which would be the more necessary when they marry according to their "love," when they would eagerly lay kingdoms, seens and moons at the feet of the loved one. Social martyrdom is a pretence and an unreality; a phantasm which only mystic poets can deem to be actual. The wreckers of society care precious little for pious society's "foolish" opinions. It is pecuniary martyrdom which they would have to suffer and which they would avoid by having this bill passed into law. If they would have the benefit of inheritance under the Hindu Law, they should be prepared to abide by all the obligations and restraints of the Hindu Law. It cannot be pretended for a moment that marriage is a slight matter; or that little avoidance or deviation from the marriage institutions is a trivial failure of obligation, an irregularity such as could be cured by a validating measure.

The Poet stigmatises the restriction of marriage within the same caste as a convention which is not based on the foundation of the moral laws. He does not call it an immoral convention. It is not by itself immoral. But to compel one to abide by it, when one is ready to give it up because it is non-moral and not binding, is to compel one to lead a life of falsehood and cowardice. That convention is not hideous in itself, but is productive of hideous consequences, when it is exalted to inviolable sacredness, such as can attach only to moral laws. So runs the argument.

I cannot see how the easing from the convention by legislation removes the taint of cowardice. How could there be heroism, when there is no fight at all? While the cowardice of the reformer is permanently and ineffaceably stamped upon his face by such a legislation, the taint of falsehood also is ineffaceably stamped alongside by it. What could be more false than that a new marriage law in utter violation of the Hindu marriage law should be passed; and that persons who make use of such a new marriage law should dare and claim to be called Hindus? They may say that they are Hindu by birth; but a Hindu by birth may cease to be a Hindu. They may say that they are Hindu in thought and philosophy; this may be doubted; but even if this is admitted, yet they certainly are not Hindu in Aachaara. There may be Hindus among Americans; more Hindus among Germans; most Christians may be unconsciously Hindu in thought and philosophy; but they are not Hindus on that account. Agreement in thought with those Hindu conventions which are obviously based on the moral laws would not alone entitle one to be a Hindu; for he may equally well be a non-Hindu.

"Morality" may endure, even if Acharam perishes; but if Acharam perishes, there is no more Hinduism. And it is a puerile false-hood to say that he is yet a Hindu, who performs or perpetrates inter-caste marriage.

The caste orninances are derided, on the sagacious-looking footing that they are not ordained for ever, but fitted in with certain historical conjunctures, which are now gone for ever. They are only historical, not Sanatana. They are not part of the Hindu doctrine, but were part and need not continue to be, part of the Hindu discipline. That is the gist of the destructive argument. There is a very large group of thinkers which declare that the so-called moral laws themselves are merely historical; that they were not always true; that the modern virtues would formerly have been vices; that it is not impossible that what is deemed virtue to-day, may in the cycle of progress come to be deemed positive vice. At that rate, we can certainly arrive at the very goal of freedom—freedom from all restraint.

(To be continued.)

Olla Podrida.

Quite recently it was discovered and proclaimed that laughter cures appendicitis. Did you all see that proclamation? The modern man is however too busy to have a hearty laugh. So he prefers surgery to laughter.

* * *

In New India on 4th February 1919 we are told that a woman voter in England did not vote for 3 reasons (1) She was'nt going to vote for one of Lloyd George's puppets; (2) She did not fancy the look of the other candidate; (3) On the day of voting she was very tired. The millennium of the vote does not seem to be so much in reality as in the imagination.

* * *

The women clerks of the York Branch of the London Joint City and Midland Bank struck work recently. The women will hereafter not only vote but will also strike. Beware!

* * *

These are really very striking times. Why! Strikes are here, there, everywhere. They are as universal as sunlight. How happy is the modern age.

* * *

Mr. Eardley Norton draws our attention to another feature of these happy times—the love of titles. He speaks of the "plastering of political heroes with assorted transmutations of the English alphabet."

* * *

This is not all. The National week is coming and has been duly proclaimed. Do you know that the motto is that "the week shall make it strong." It is anyhow a relief that *Desiya Sikshanam* has vanished from the seal. But it is to reappear in the daily *Kolam* in the front of houses.

SCRUTATOR.

Our Social Problem and the Bhagavad Gita By K. S. Ramaswamy Sastri B.A., B.L.

Price per copy Annas 4 only,
For 50 copies Rs. 10 only.

Imitations of Tagore.

(BY AN ADMIRER)

I

In the markets of life I have been busy buying the petty glittering things of daily making and daily breaking.

Some of these were very pretty to behold and I could scarcely take my eyes off them. But men with louder voices and pushful ways elbowed me out and took them away after a furious race of bids.

My inability to compete with them did not dull the edge of my desire and the passion and fury of my tell-tale eyes cast darkness over the hearts of all who were bartering life's truth for life's illusions with a devotedness worthy of a better cause.

Ah! Save me by turning my heart to see the eternal stars of Thy love. I am tired of the toys in life's petty shops.

II

O sweet and loving mother, what joy is there for me in life except at thy feet!

Thy winning smile shines upon my heart from flower and star, from the green of the earth and the blue of the sky.

In the human heart you are seated in glory as the golden radiance is seated in the lighted lamp.

Your play in the world of life is at its sweetest when young eyes speak love to each other in silence of tongues and speech of glance.

You look with approving eyes on all who serve thy children with hands yearning for service, tongues eager to soothe suffering hearts, and souls full of the passion of renunciation and love.

But thy infinite love is for those who adore and hymn thee night and day and who carry Thy vision as a perpetual rapture in their hearts.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B. A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.